



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,995	08/04/2000	Sang-Uuk Song	P2026	2594

33942 7590 06/05/2003

CHA & REITER
411 HACKENSACK AVE, 9TH FLOOR
HACKENSACK, NJ 07601

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TU X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/632,995

Applicant(s)

SONG, SANG-UUK

Examiner

Tu X Nguyen

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. In response to applicant argument, filed 4/28/03, the applicants disagree the cited reference fails to disclose "informing, by the portable radio telephone, to a mobile switching center if the portable radio telephone is deviated from the home zone". However, applicants' argument is not persuasive because the mobile station determines whether it is in its home system or market area by analyzing the SID (see Bridges, col.12 lines 20-21). The mobile station obtains service from the current wireless carrier (see Bridges, col.12 lines 44-45). And if the mobile station is available, the HLR will return location information to the central database (100) to permit routing the entry information to the mobile station via the serving MSC and the wireless network infrastructure for communicating with the mobile station (see Bridges, col.17 lines 37-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 12 and 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al. (US Patent 6,148,197) and further in view of Chow et al. (US Patent 6,456,839).

As to claims 1-2 and 14, Bridges et al. disclose "receiving, by the portable radio telephone (fig.2B,C), a home-zone list downloaded from a home location register" (see col.7 lines 30-62);

Determining, by the portable radio telephone, whether the portable radio telephone deviates from the home zone (see col.12 lines 20-50); and

Informing, by the portable radio telephone, to a mobile switching center (106, fig.4) if the portable radio telephone is deviated from the home zone (see col.12 lines 20-50 and col.17 line 58 through col.18 line 11). The examiner interprets "routing information" correspond to "informing".

Bridges et al. fail to disclose a "first charging rate" and "second charging rate".

Chow et al. disclose a "first charging rate" and "second charging rate" see (col.6 lines 34-38). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bridges with the above teaching of Chow in order to provide neighborhood cordless services at a single rate such that there is no air time change for calls made within a home neighborhood zone or subscribed-to visiting neighborhood zone(s) (as suggested by Chow et al., see col.1 lines 10-15).

Regarding claim 12, the modified Bridges et al. disclose everything as claim 1 above. More specifically, the modified Bridges et al. disclose "comparing the home-

zone list to a sector of a currently tuned base transceiver station" (see Bridges col.6 line 52 through col.7 line 4 and abstract).

5. Claims 3-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al., in view of Chow et al. and further in view of Tiedemann, Jr. et al. (US Patent 5,642,398).

As to claim 3, the modified Bridges et al. disclose everything as claim 1-2 above. More specifically, the modified Bridges et al. disclose "checking whether a location registration request is received from a portable radio telephone; and if the location registration request is received, checking whether the portable radio telephone deviates from the home zone by checking whether the current position of the portable radio telephone is included in a home-zone list" (see Chow, coll.8 lines 39-65);

upon receiving a call origination from the portable radio telephone, releasing the call origination if the portable radio telephone is deviated from the home zone (see Chow, col.7 lines 20-22);

disregarding a call termination if the portable radio telephone deviated from the home zone receives the call termination (see ^{Chow} col.7 lines 24-25); and,

the modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose preventing a paging by the MSC to notify the portable radio telephone that the portable telephone deviated from the home zone.

Tiedemann, Jr. et al. disclose preventing a paging by the MSC to notify the portable radio telephone that the portable telephone deviated from the home zone (see

col.13 lines 60-63). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Bridges with the above teaching of Tiedemann, Jr. in order to prevent a mobile station that failed to execute a power down registration from being uselessly paged.

As to claim 4, the modified Bridges disclose informing the portable radio telephone when the call origination or the call termination is released (see Chow, col.8 lines 1-19 and lines 60-65).

As to claim 5, the modified Bridges et al. disclose downloading the home-zone list in a memory means of the portable radio telephone (see col.7 lines 30-62);

As to claim 6, the modified Bridges et al. disclose a "first charging rate" and "second charging rate" (see Chow, col.6 lines 34-38).

6. Claims 13 and 15-16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al., in view of Chow et al., in view of Tiedemann, Jr. and further in view of Soliman (US Patent 6,321,090).

As to claims 13 and 16, the modified Bridges et al. disclose the home-zone list includes cell identification, sector identification, defining the home zone (see Tiedemann, Jr. fig. 1,3)

The modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose round trip information (see col.15 lines 24-30). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Bridges et al. with the

above teaching of Soliman in order to provide the map information when the mobile station is within the predetermined handoff area.

The modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose "maximum and minimum" round trip delay information. Official notice is taken that the concept to provide maximum and minimum round trip delay information is well known in the art. It would have been obvious that the closet distance from mobile station to base station is minimum round trip delay and the farthest distance form mobile station to base station is maximum round trip delay.

As to claim 15, the modified Bridges et al. disclose everything as to claim 1 above. More specifically, the modified Bridges et al. disclose "pseudo noise" (see Soliman, col. 15 lines 24-30).

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al., in view of Chow et al., in view of Soliman and further in view of van der Salm et al.

As to claim 17, the modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose a flash memory.

Van der Salm et al. disclose a flash memory (see col.9 lines 5-14). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Bridges with the above teaching of Van der Salm in order to provide telecommunication device having memory means for storing data specific and exchanging services between the telecommunication network and telecommunication device when accessing a particular service.

8. Claims 7-10, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al., in view of Chow et al. and further in view of Seazholtz et al. (US Patent 6,128,489).

Regarding claim 7, the modified Bridges et al. disclose everything as claim 1 above. However, the modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose "comparing the predetermined signal".

Seazholtz et al. disclose "comparing the predetermined signal" (see col.17 lines 5-24). The examiner interprets RSSI corresponds to predetermined signal. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Bridges with the above teaching of Seazholtz et al. in order to provide continuous cell coverage communication by detecting signal strength (RSSI) by mobile station.

As to claim 8, the modified Bridges disclose the signal transmitted from the BTS includes a base transceiver station identification information (see Chow, col.15 lines 9-19).

As to claim 9, the modified Bridges et al. disclose the BTS ID information is transmitted via a paging channel (see Chow, col.18 lines 19-28).

Regarding claim 10, the modified Bridges et al. disclose everything as claim 13 above.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridges et al., in view of Chow et al., in view of Seazholtz et al. and further in view of van der Salm et al. (US Patent (6,345,184)).

As to claim 11, the modified Bridges et al. fail to disclose a flash memory.

Van der Salm et al. disclose a flash memory (see col.9 lines 5-14). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the modified Bridges with the above teaching of Van der Salm in order to provide telecommunication device having memory means for storing data specific and exchanging services between the telecommunication network and telecommunication device when accessing a particular service.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2684

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tu Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian Chin, can be reached at (703) 308-6739.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office at (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

TN

May 28, 2003


NAY MAUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER